

From: [Humphrey, Alan](#)
To: [Gannon, Nick](#)
Cc: [Todd, Brandi](#); [Leos, Valmichael](#)
Subject: Re: SJWP Dive Report Draft - Round 2
Date: Wednesday, January 20, 2016 9:26:55 AM

Any time Fri AM good for me. I can review sonar options if you want, although sonar with diver confirmation is usually best.

Sent from my iPad

On Jan 20, 2016, at 7:49 AM, Gannon, Nick <Gannon.Nick@epa.gov> wrote:

Friday is good. Anyway we could make it a little earlier (1000 or 1030 CT)? Thanks!

From: Todd, Brandi
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 8:24 PM
To: Leos, Valmichael
Cc: Gannon, Nick; Humphrey, Alan
Subject: Re: SJWP Dive Report Draft - Round 2

Thanks guys for the input. I won't get to it until Thursday because I just had my leg cut on today :) All is well, just not going to try and think too hard while on hydrocodone.

I sent a clean copy of this draft to Gary so we can have a discussion about it on Friday. Everyone available at 11am? Tell me when you're available if that doesn't work for ya.

This is to discuss if the Report will meet all of his needs. When we spoke last week, he had one specific request for the report: Was the sonar a useful tool to identify potential 'holes' in the cap? He is making a decision whether or not to require the RP to use a sonar.

Brandi Todd
Federal On-Scene Coordinator
US EPA Region 6
Mobile : 972-974-2971

On Jan 19, 2016, at 12:55 PM, Leos, Valmichael <Leos.Valmichael@epa.gov> wrote:

All,

See attached Leos edits / questions to dive report. Excellent write up.
Just a few minor tweaks!



9680645

Sincerely,

Valmichael Leos
Remedial Project Manager
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 6
O: 214-665-2283
E: leos.valmichael@epa.gov
[<image001.jpg>](#) [<image006.jpg>](#)

From: Gannon, Nick
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 12:39 PM
To: Humphrey, Alan; Todd, Brandi; Leos, Valmichael
Subject: RE: SJWP Dive Report Draft - Round 2

<!--[if !supportLists]--> <!--[endif]-->The "lines" I found were taut, with no growth. They were about the diameter of heavy kite string.

<!--[if !supportLists]--> <!--[endif]-->I found a sunken log or two but not much organic.

<!--[if !supportLists]--> <!--[endif]-->The images seem like edges in the material deposition. Are the pix from the bottom or an edge/slope? There wasn't really anything else down there except rocks.

Alan, there was a lot of activity during the week before Xmas. Here's a link to the local news coverage:

https://www.google.com/?gws_rd=ssl#q=san+jacinto+waste+pits&tbm=nws

Also a short video on how the cap was laid:
<http://www.sanjacintofacts.com/>

From: Humphrey, Alan
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 11:49 AM
To: Gannon, Nick; Todd, Brandi; Leos, Valmichael
Subject: Re: SJWP Dive Report Draft - Round 2

Agreed, this was not a comprehensive cap survey, we would have to spend 2-3 days in the NW area doing diver transects at 5 ft or so spacing to cover 100% of the NW area. I am surprised their recent bathymetry did not detect a hole, the rock layer vs soft sediment/waste material should give them different depth readings

(the hole should show up as a hole), not sure what their coverage is. We mention the hole as 25 square feet, I know the probe points indicate the hole is at least 17 feet across, we can estimate 25 feet across, not sure where 25 square feet came from, since we only have a length not a width? Sorry, I was focused on the sonar so I probably missed some of the ongoing discussion during probing.

As far as sonar, please look at these two images, neither is great quality but the features are there. Note the lines running across the bottom. These are either old lines still there from prior sampling with growth on them or possibly tree branches or ridges or buckling in the surface of the rock cover. Nick, I think you were following some old line(s) on the bottom early on day one? Was there growth on them? You also ran into some tree branches also? Just trying to see whether we can rule these out as any other issues with the rock cover.

Any word whether PRP is planning any immediate action-like applying more rock?

From: Gannon, Nick

Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 2:15 PM

To: Todd, Brandi; Humphrey, Alan; Leos, Valmichael

Subject: RE: SJWP Dive Report Draft - Round 2

From the PURPOSE section:

- Someone mentioned (Alan?) that this was a cursory CAP inspection and not to imply we surveyed the whole 14 acre site.

From the ACTIVITIES section:

- I think PRP is now RP (Responsible Parties).

From the OBSERVATION section:

- Val, didn't the calibrated PVC pole go deeper than 6 ft.?
- Area A: Should we make the statement: *the area suspected of lacking rock is approximately 25 sq.*
- Area B+C: Should we make the statement(s): *This observation supports current maps of the site identifying this location as the edge of the cap.*

Maybe use more generic terms and allow the reader to draw their own conclusions. I anticipate this report going will get a lot of attention.

When we have the final draft, I'd suggest having someone (Ashley?) do a peer/format review. Also, to check that the maps and photos match the

report references.

All just my two cents. Good job Brandi.

Thanks,
Nick

From: Todd, Brandi

Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 5:57 AM

To: Humphrey, Alan; Leos, Valmichael; Gannon, Nick

Subject: SJWP Dive Report Draft - Round 2

Here is the dive report with my edits. Still needs a bit of work. Please review and let me know your suggestions.

Brandi Todd

Federal On-Scene Coordinator

US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6

972-974-2971

<SJWP dive report (Dec 2015) rev03_v1.docx>